

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

United States of America

v.

Criminal No. 06-cr-018-01-PB

Travis Blodgett

O R D E R

Defendant moves for a copy of the indictment against him and for unredacted discovery.

I do not know what Mr. Foley is thinking in claiming that his client never received copies of an indictment in light of the following:

1. I have listened to the tape of the January 30, 2006 arraignment. I ordered the Clerk to provide Travis Blodgett with the indictment in court. He read it and he and Mr. Foley acknowledged on the record that he understood it. He was then provided a copy.

2. A waiver of defendant's appearance on the superceding indictment, signed by Travis Blodgett and Mr. Foley acknowledges receipt of the indictment.

3. Mr. Foley is registered as a CM/ECF user and can copy the indictment by clicking onto it and hitting print.

The motion (document no. 30) is frivolous and untrue with regard to this claim.

Defense counsel claims to have had problems "opening" the CD containing the discovery but never picked up the phone to call to seek help from Attorney Feith. Apparently, defense counsel got access.

Defense counsel now complains about redactions in general but not a single one in particular. Again he made no effort to "meet and confer" prior to filing his motion. The government maintains that the redactions are limited to information which "could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy" 5 U.S.C. § 552(B)(7)(c)(2006). As such they are required to be redacted. Other redactions were made under 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(a). Unless and until counsel can point to redaction of information necessary to defense of the case he is entitled to no more than what he got.

The motion (document no. 30) is denied.

SO ORDERED.



James R. Muirhead
United States Magistrate Judge

Date: June 6, 2006

cc: Richard N. Foley, Esq.
William E. Christie, Esq.
Donald A. Feith, Esq.
U.S. Probation
U.S. Marshal